From:	Joshua Hantman <hantman.joshua@gmail.com>
To:	ehud barak <ehbarak1@gmail.com>
CC:	
Date:	Tue, 5/14/2013 8:10:22 PM
Subject:	Re: Marvin etc

לתיקונים/אישורך...

Hi Marvin,

Sorry it took a while to respond. In response to your questions:

We never mentioned nuclear weapons or the exact nature of the commitment.

The idea was the following: We were negotiating peace with the Palestinians that was supposed to end the conflict. It was clear what we were *giving*, but we needed assurances for our security. Our negotiating stance with the Arabs is always based on our security needs and sovereign rights, i.e. when we recognize a contiguous, viable Palestinian state; we obviously need – in exchange – our security guaranteed. This includes the finality of claims and demands, an Israeli presence along the Jordan River, early warning systems in the mountainous region etc.

Both Israel and the U.S. have consistently rejected the idea of a defense treaty *before* a final peace treaty. It has been raised many times in the past, and rejected many times, by both sides.

The U.S. rejects it because you cannot sign a defense treaty with a country that does not have recognized borders. When would it be activated? Legal advisors from the U.S. would never let this pass. It simply did not make sense from a legal point of view.

Israel also rejects it; but for different reasons. If we have anything that looks like a full guarantee from the U.S., then our negotiating position is weakened. We have security demands on the ground that will be undermined because the other side will always claim, “you have the U.S. defense treaty… So why do you need X,Y and Z…”.

Therefore it was important to cover *all* of the issues: Borders, the finality of claims, the recognition of the Arab world, Israel’s security needs etc. Only then, would it be possible to have a defense treaty with the U.S., as a final guarantee of the peace treaty.

I told Clinton, that *if* we can finalize a peace agreement with the Palestinians, with Syria, and as a result with Lebanon… only *then* should we cap this peace agreement with a defense treaty with the U.S. as an extra guarantee.

It [the defense treaty] would also serve as an ultimate answer to criticism from within. We live in a democracy and criticism is inevitable. When you sign an agreement you, of course, take risks; the defense treaty – on top of the security arrangements within the peace treaty – would serve to solidify the agreement and convince the Israeli public of the viability of the treaty as a whole.

On Tue, May 14, 2013 at 11:27 AM, ehud barak <ehbarak1@gmail.com> wrote:

> I'm back in IL. Pl call. EB
>
> Sent from my iPhone

On May 4, 2013, at 10:52, Josh Hantman <hantman.joshua@gmail.com> wrote:

No prob.

What's the best number to get you on?
What time are you free?

ב-May 4, 2013, 4:22 בשעה, ehud barak <ehbarak1@gmail.com> כתב/ה:

Dear Josh
Re Marvin: will do it today.
Re 1Fam : they'll have to approach my agent. Don Walker. At Harry Walker Agency. He'll make the decision.
Best
EB

Sent from my iPhone

On May 3, 2013, at 23:51, Josh Hantman <hantman.joshua@gmail.com> wrote:

Shabbat Shalom EB.

A couple of issues:

1)We still need to sort out Marvin's answers.

2) One Family UK would love for you to speak to them in June - they have a tight budget, but they are a very worthwhile organization. I can help arrange if you're interested...

Pls let me know,

Josh